



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,797	10/27/2003	Masayuki Takahashi	244397US6	1080
22850	7590	10/20/2008		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
HALDM, SAHERA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2457				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/20/2008		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com

oblonpat@oblon.com

jgardner@oblon.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/692,797

**Applicant(s)**

TAKAHASHI, MASAYUKI

**Examiner**

SAHERA HALIM

**Art Unit**

2457

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The Office Action is responsive to Amendment filed on June 27, 2008.
2. Claims 1-25 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1, 7, 8, 17, and 18 recites the limitation "that is recognized on the second network" in claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-22, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S Pat Pub. No. 2002/0138552 to DeBruine et al. (hereinafter DeBruine).
7. Regarding claim 1, DeBruine teaches an information processing system including a first information processing apparatus (see Fig. 1A, computer clients) connected with a first network ( LAN 16) and also connected with a second network (Internet 10) via

an address translator for addresses translation (see par. 0024, the firewall may perform NAT), a second information processing apparatus configured to perform communication with the first information processing apparatus (another computer 18 of Fig. 1A); and a third information processing apparatus (server node 12 of Fig. 1A and 1B) connected with the second network (connected to the Internet), for managing communication between the first information processing apparatus and the second information processing apparatus (see Fig. 1A – 1B; and abstract), wherein the first information processing apparatus (client computer) requests the third information processing apparatus (server node 12) to provide an information associated with connection of the second information processing apparatus (see par. 0020 – 0027; the client submits a search to the server 12); the third information processing apparatus provides information associated with the connection of the second information processing apparatus to the first information processing apparatus (see par. 0028 – 0032; the server provides the client with information of local nodes); the first information processing apparatus determines, on the basis of the information provided by the third information processing apparatus, whether the second information processing apparatus is connected with a same network as that with which the first information processing apparatus is connected (see par. 0029 – 0038; searched results are sorted first by locally reachable client nodes, followed by directly and then returned to the requesting node); and the first information processing apparatus performs communication with the second information processing apparatus such that if the second information processing apparatus is determined to be connected with the same

network as that with which the first information processing apparatus is connected, communication with the second information processing apparatus is performed on the basis of a network-specific address defined on the first network ( see par. 0030 – 0038; If the node registry indicates that NAT has been performed on both nodes, the target node is considered to within the same network as the requesting client) , while if the second information processing apparatus is determined not to be connected with the same network as that with which the first information processing apparatus is connected, communication with the second information processing apparatus is performed on the basis of a different address than the network-specific address, said different address being a global address that is recognized on the second network (see par. 0027 – 0038; If the server can connect to the client node 14 through the client IP address, then node 14 is directly reachable form the network 10).

8. Regarding 2, DeBruine teaches an information processing system according to claim 1, wherein the first information processing apparatus requests the third information processing apparatus to provide, as the information associated with the connection of the second information processing apparatus to the first information processing apparatus, the global address, defined on the second network, of the second information processing apparatus; the third information processing apparatus provides, as the information associated with the connection of the second information processing apparatus to the first information processing apparatus,, the global address, defined on the second network, of the second information processing apparatus; and

the first information processing apparatus determines, on the basis of the address, defined on the second network, of the second information processing apparatus, whether the second information processing apparatus is connected with the same network as that with which the first information processing apparatus is connected (see par.0021 - 0032) .

9. Regarding claim 3, DeBruine teaches an information processing system according to claim 1, wherein the first information processing apparatus requests, as the information associated with the connection, information indicating whether the second information processing apparatus and the first information processing apparatus are connected with the same network; the third information processing apparatus examines whether the second information processing apparatus and the first information processing apparatus are connected with the same network and the third information processing apparatus provides a result of the examination as the information associated with the connection; and the first information processing apparatus determines, on the basis of a received information indicating the result of the examination performed by the third information processing apparatus, whether the second information processing apparatus is connected with the same network as that with which the first information processing apparatus is connected (see par. 0017 – 0028).

10. Regarding claim 4, DeBruine teaches an information processing system according to claim 3, wherein the third information processing apparatus examines

whether the first information processing apparatus and the second information processing apparatus are connected with the same network, on the basis of addresses defined on the second network, of the first information processing apparatus and the second information processing apparatus (see par. 0017 – 0028).

11. Regarding claim 5, DeBruine teaches an information processing system according to claim 3, wherein the third information processing apparatus examines whether the second information processing apparatus and the first information processing apparatus are connected with the same address translator to examine whether the second information processing apparatus and the first information processing apparatus are connected with the same network (See Fig. 2 – 4 and par. 0023 – 0035).

12. Regarding claim 6, DeBruine teaches an information processing system according to claim 5, wherein the third information processing apparatus examines whether the second information processing apparatus and the first information processing apparatus have the same global address defined on the second network to examine whether the second information processing apparatus and the first information processing apparatus are connected with the same network (See Fig. 2 – 4 and par. 0023 – 0035).

13. Regarding claim 7, this claim has similar limitations as to claim 1; therefore, claim 7 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

14. Regarding claim 8, DeBruine teaches an information processing apparatus that performs communication with another information processing apparatus, the information processing apparatus being connected with a first network and also connected, via an address translator for addresses translation, with a second network with which a server is connected, the information processing apparatus comprising (abstract and Fig. 1)

request means for requesting the server to provide information associated with connection of said another information processing apparatus see par. 0020 – 0027; the client submits a search to the server 12);

reception means for receiving information associated with the connection of said another information processing apparatus from the server (see par. 0028 – 0032; the server provides the client with information of local nodes); and

communication means for performing communication with said another information processing apparatus such that the communication means determines, on the basis of the information received from the server, whether said another information processing apparatus is connected with a same network as that with which the information processing apparatus is connected (see Fig. 4), and if it is determined that said another information processing apparatus is connected with the same network as that with which the information processing apparatus is connected, the communication means performs communication with said another information processing apparatus on



the basis of a network specific address defined on the first network ( see par. 0030 – 0038; If the node registry indicates that NAT has been performed on both nodes, the target node is considered to within the same network as the requesting client), while if it is determined that said another information processing apparatus is not connected with the same network as that with which the information processing apparatus is connected, the communication means performs communication with said another information processing apparatus on the basis of a different address than the network specific address being a global address that is recognized on the second network (see par. 0027 – 0038; If the server can connect to the client node 14 through the client IP address, then node 14 is directly reachable form the network 10).

15. Claims 9 – 12 have similar limitations as to claims 1-6; therefore, they are rejected under the same rational as claims 1-6.

16. Regarding claim 13, DeBruine teaches an information processing apparatus according to claim 8, wherein the first network is a LAN (see par. 0017); the second network is the Internet (see Fig. 1 and par. 0016); the network specific address on the first network is a local address; and the different address on the second network is a global address (see Fig. 1A-B and par. 0016 – 0017).

17. Regarding claim14, DeBruine teaches an information processing apparatus according to claim 8, wherein if the information received from the server indicates that

said another information processing apparatus is not connected with the same network as that with which the information processing apparatus is connected, the request means further requests the server to provide the different address, defined on the second network, of the information processing apparatus (see par. 0022 – 0031).

18. Regarding claim 15, DeBurine teaches an information processing apparatus according to claim 8, wherein if it is determined that said another information processing apparatus is not connected with the same network as that with which the information processing apparatus is connected, the communication means transmits the different address, defined on the second network, of the information processing apparatus to said another information processing apparatus via the server and receives the different address, defined on the second network, of said another information processing apparatus via the server (see par. 0022 – 0031).

19. Regarding claim 16, DeBurine teaches an information processing apparatus according to claim 8, wherein if it is determined that said another information processing apparatus is connected with the same network as that with which the information processing apparatus is connected, the communication means transmits the network specific address, defined on the first network, of the information processing apparatus to said another information processing apparatus via the server and receives the network specific address, defined on the first network, of said another information processing

apparatus via the server (see par. 0022 – 0031).

20. Claims 17 and 18 have similar limitations as to claims 1-7, and therefore, they are rejected under the same rational.

21. Claims 19 – 22, 24 and 25 have similar limitations as claims 1-16; therefore, they are rejected under the same rational.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

22. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

23. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeBruine. DeBruine does not explicitly teach an information processing apparatus according to claim 19, wherein the information mean transmits 1-bit data indicating the result of the examination performed by the examination means to the first apparatus. However, DeBurine teaches transmitting the examination results to the first apparatus in a search form. Therefore, having the teachings of DeBruine it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill at the time of the invention to transmit the examination in a 1-bit form in order to save network bandwidth (see par. 0007).

***Response to Arguments***

24. Applicant's arguments filed in June 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the reference fails to "describe how to establish the peer-to-peer communication within the network". The examiner respectfully disagrees. The reference teaches network 10 (Internet) and private networks 16 (LAN) (see Fig. 1A). The background of the reference explains that typically file transfers occur over the Internet and to optimize cost and bandwidth it is determined if clients and server nodes are on the same LAN. If it is determined that the client and server are on the same LAN, files are transferred locally. Transferring files on the Internet is well known in the art as explained in the background of the reference.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., switching addresses depending on whether the sending terminal and the receiving terminal are on the same LAN or different LAN) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

### ***Conclusion***

25. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SAHERA HALIM whose telephone number is (571)272-4003. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sahera Halim  
Patent Examiner

/ARIO ETIENNE/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457